



# United States Department of the Interior

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Kremmling Field Office  
2103 E. Park Avenue, PO Box 68  
Kremmling, CO 80459



## RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #4

**Kremmling Chamber Building, 203 Park Avenue, Kremmling, CO**  
**Monday, February 11, 2008 (5:00 – 8:00 PM)**

### SUMMARY NOTES

**Attendees:** Clare Bastable (Northwest Resource Advisory Council), Dave Costlow (whitewater rafting), Carol Petersen (grazing permittee), Nicholas Peterson (Power World), Jerry Stahl (Grand County Wilderness Group), Holly Whitten (hiking), John Monkouski (BLM), Bernice Sterin (BLM), Dave Stout (BLM), Andy Windsor (BLM), David Batts (EMPS, Inc.), Chad Ricklefs (Tetra Tech, Inc.), Forrest Hester (general public), Paul Renfro (general public), Jeff Ehlert (general public), Tony Wasson (general public), David Parri (general public), Ken Fosha (general public)

#### Handouts:

- Agenda
- Recreation Alternatives Matrix (2/11/08)
- Natural Resource Recreation Settings Matrix
- Draft - SRMA Recreation Management Zones Maps:
  - Blue River – Alternative B
  - Headwaters – Alternative B
  - Headwaters – Alternative D
  - Laramie River – Alternative D
  - North Park – Alternative D
  - North Sand Hills – Alternatives B & D
  - North Sand Hills – Alternative C
  - Strawberry – Alternative C
  - Strawberry – Alternative D
  - Strawberry – Physical Setting
  - Strawberry – Social Setting
  - Strawberry – Administrative Setting
  - Upper Colorado – Alternatives B, C, and D
  - Woford – Alternative B
  - Woford – Alternative C
  - Woford – Alternative D
- Evaluation Factors – Commercial, Competitive and Organized Group SRPs (Outside of Special Areas) (Price Field Office Draft RMP)

### WELCOME

David Batts (EMPS, Inc.) welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation followed by round robin of introductions. Joe Stout (BLM) was unable to attend the meeting but would like to thank the group for their participation and input since the last meeting.

### PLANNING UPDATES

- GSFO RAC subgroup met last week. David Batts described the use of SRMAs. SRMA's do not mean resource protection. Need to consider the intent of why an SRMA is being designated.

**REVISED SRMA WORK SESSION**

- Handouts: Recreation Alternatives Matrix (2/11/08); Natural Resource Recreation Settings Matrix; Evaluation Factors – Commercial, Competitive and Organized Group SRPs (Outside of Special Areas) (Price Field Office Draft RMP); Draft - SRMA Recreation Management Zones Maps (see list of maps above under “Handouts”)
- Andy Windsor (BLM) made a PowerPoint presentation on Recreation Management. Goal of today’s presentation is to provide a brief overview the changes that have been made to the alternatives matrix since the last meeting. Permitting process will also be discussed.
  - Discussed ERMA’s: resource protection, recreation, and conflicts. ERMA action is common to all action alternatives. Two allowable uses: Allowable Use I and Allowable Use II. ERMA’s would suit conservation alternatives better than SRMA’s. ERMA’s under Alternative C are meant to protect resources from recreation. ERMA’s and SRMA’s do not necessarily preclude oil and gas development.
- Blue River Discussion (refer to matrix for specific changes).
  - BLM would work with private landowners, USFS, and BOR to manage access points on the Blue River.
  - RAC question: What direction is the BLM leaning towards, how will funding of alternatives occur? BLM response: Partners have been identified for potential SRMA’s to help fund these areas. BLM is relying on partnerships to manage SRMA’s.
  - RAC comment: Difficult to understand the concept of the proposed ERMA’s/SRMA’s without knowing what other resource activities are occurring in them. BLM response: This committee is looking at the recreation component only at this time. The draft RMP will evaluate the impacts associated with other resource actions. RAC comment: Would like to see more information on the intent of management for areas that have an SRMA proposed in one alternative, but as an ERMA in another. BLM response: BLM will provide guidance that would illustrate difference between the SRMA’s and ERMA’s in alternatives.
- Headwaters Discussion (refer to matrix for specific changes).
  - Alternative D includes two zones, non-motorized (east) and motorized (west). Destination market strategy, including front-range area. RAC comment: Would like to see descriptions of the markets that are being targeted (destination, community). Social setting has been changed based on RAC comments. The maximum number of encounters would be 14 with 7-12 people per group.
  - Alternative C is now an ERMA; recreation would not be emphasized in the Headwaters.
  - Alternative B is now one zone (SRMA), nonmotorized. Community recreation market strategy targeted at residents of Grand County.
- Permits (see handout): BLM needs to set permit allocations. Proposed permit classification table would be used to determine impacts of the applicant’s proposal. Type of permit needed would be determined by criteria in table. Some permits allowed in certain SRMA’s. Different zones have different setting prescriptions. Proposal needs to be consistent with goals of the RMP; then look at potential conflicts of proposal. There would not be a set number of available permits through the new permit process. Proposed permit process provides flexibility in providing number of permits. There would be no moratorium on the number of permits available. Criteria would also be applied to ERMA’s.
  - RAC question: Would ranchers working cattle be considered an encounter? BLM response: This will need to be determined during completion of the Draft RMP.
  - RAC question: Will there be motorized vehicles in Zone I of Headwaters? BLM response: Zone 1 will be non-motorized; however, motorized (administrative) access would remain available for permit holders.
- Strawberry Discussion (refer to matrix for specific changes).
  - Alternative B, ERMA. Other activities occurring would remain. Potential for user conflicts.
  - Alternative C becomes one zone. SRMA with no motors.
  - Alternative D becomes two zones – Zone 1 motorized and Zone 2 nonmotorized
  - RAC comment: Zone 1 should be nonmotorized and Zone 2 should be motorized. Pushing motorized use into Zone 1 will create conflicts. BLM response: Based on comments from previous RAC subcommittee meeting, BLM revised Alternative D to allow for both types of uses and to accommodate neighbors in Zone 2.
  - Setting prescriptions (refer to Strawberry handouts). ERMA’s do not have setting prescriptions. There will be a map in the RMP associated with each setting (physical, social, administration).

Remoteness based on proximity to roads. Maps will show where setting characteristics exist on the ground. Visitor contacts will be mapped for social setting. Mechanized use component will be mapped in the administrative setting (front country and back country). RAC comment: Task during implementation will be to manage for the prescribed settings.

- Zone 1 social setting would be managed as backcountry under Alternative D.
- Public question: How would boating on the Fraser River be handled? BLM response: This is not the primary use for this area so conflicts would be managed for the primary use. BLM wants the Strawberry area to be managed for community market; not a destination market.
- RAC question: How is winter activities addressed? BLM response: Designated nonmotorized areas will also be nonmotorized during the winter.
- Wolford SRMA. SRMA boundary is County Road 22, east of 224, up to junction of 25 and 26.
  - RAC question: How will the rifle range be handled? BLM response: This area would be managed for OHVs so the rifle range would need to be relocated. BLM would like rifle ranges to be moved off of BLM land. Livestock may be impacted because under an SRMA recreation would be the primary use. Would need to determine how to mitigate these conflicts.
  - RAC question: Would the ERMA handle the Wolford travel management? BLM response: BLM would manage for a different resource.
- Upper Colorado Discussion (refer to matrix for specific changes).
  - The boundary has gotten smaller. Boundary also includes fishing access on the Blue River. RAC question: Why was SRMA made smaller? BLM response: The Colorado River is managed for river use so other areas can be managed through other measures (ORVs, etc.).
  - Public question: When will the land exchange at the access to the Blue occur? BLM response: Land exchange will not take place until after the RMP is completed. RMP will be used to help analyze the exchange.
  - Alternative B and D are the same.
  - SRP permits for individual use. Used to help collect data on how many people are using Gore Canyon. Self-issuing permits, no limits, no cost for permit. Stipulations can also be associated with individual SRPs. Area would need to be designated as a “Special Area”. This is the only area in this alternative designated for SRPs.
  - Social setting on the river. Need to look at group size.
  - Only four permits issued for 100 or more people. (Zone 3)
  - Public question: Why is GSFO managing for fewer people below state bridge? BLM response: KFO will discuss with GSFO.
  - Public question: Does the group size include the guides. BLM response: Yes. The goal is manage for the experience.
  - RAC question: Why 50 people per group and not 100 people? BLM response: 100 people would make it an urban setting.
  - Alternative C has less people.
  - RAC/Public concern: Concerned with the group size. Should a larger group size be provided in Alternative D?
  - RAC question: Why is there not always a variation between all Alternatives (e.g., Colo. River Alternatives B and D are the same)? BLM response: In some areas the public comments and staff analysis suggested that there were not a large divergence in issues/solutions.

#### **OTHER ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

- RAC subcommittee is tasked to provide final range of recreation alternatives to RAC.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT/QUESTIONS**

- What is the reason for no commercial outfitting on the Lower Blue? BLM response: BLM doesn't manage very many access points on this stretch so it is hard to provide management for this area.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

- Next KFO RAC Subcommittee meeting is scheduled as follows (5:00pm – 8:00pm) (Kremmling Chamber Building):
  - Thursday, February 21, 2008. Topics include: Discuss changes made to the alternatives since the February 11 meeting. RAC subcommittee will provide final approval of the proposed SRMAs and ERMAs.

**ACTION ITEMS**

- ☐ For future meeting dates, see “Next Meeting” above.
- ☐ **BLM:** Talk to BLM resource staff regarding other management activities that are occurring in the ERMA. Provide guidance that would illustrate difference between the No Action ERMA and an Alternative C ERMA.
- ☐ **BLM:** Describe the markets that are being targeted (e.g., destination market, community market).
- ☐ **BLM:** Provide reasoning for why GSFO is managing for fewer people on the Colorado River below state bridge?

*CRR – February 11, 2008*